

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number

0500-0614

Case Title:

Village of Crestwood, IL

Reporting Office:

Chicago, IL, Area Office

Subject of Report:

Interview of (b) (7)(C)

Activity Date:

April 29, 2009

Copies to:

Related Files:

Reporting Official and Date:

(b) (7)(C) SA

07-MAY-2009, Signed by: (b) (7)(C)

Approving Official and Date:

(b) (7)(C) SAC

13-MAY-2009, Approved by: (b) (7)(C), SAC

SYNOPSIS

04/29/2009 - The reporting agent and SA (b) (7)(C), Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Coast Guard Investigative Service, Chicago Resident Office, conducted a voluntary interview of (b) (7)(C), former Service Director for the Village of Crestwood, Illinois, pursuant to the service of a federal search warrant at the Village of Crestwood, Illinois.

DETAILS

On Wednesday, April 29, 2009, at approximately 0915CST, the reporting agent and (b) (7)(C) Special Agent, Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Coast Guard Investigative Service, Chicago Resident Office, conducted a voluntary interview of (b) (7)(C), former Service Director for the Village of Crestwood. The interview was conducted at the residence of (b) (7)(C) located at (b) (7)(C) Crestwood, Illinois 60445, and was concurrent with the service of a federal search warrant at the Village of Crestwood.

Name: (b) (7)(C)

DOB: (b) (7)(C)

Address: (b) (7)(C)

Crestwood, Illinois 60445

IL DLN: (b) (7)(C)

(H) (b) (7)(C)

(C) (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C) stated (b) (7)(C) was the Service Director for the Village of Crestwood from 1981 to 2005. In that role, (b) (7)(C) described (b) (7)(C) duties as being a liaison between the mayor and trustees and the various Village departments. He also handled non-police type complaints. (b) (7)(C) currently acts as a paid consultant for the Village, in which (b) (7)(C) prepares its monthly newsletter, The Crestwood Advisor.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.

It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number

0500-0614

According to (b) (7)(C), the Village's drinking water well was used as an extra source of water, i.e.: for drought periods, supplementing fire fighting efforts and also conserving the amount of Chicago water that the Village was purchasing. (b) (7)(C) did not know why more well water was not used in place of water purchased from Alsip, if it was an effort to conserve funds. (b) (7)(C) also mentioned it was a matter of practicing water conservation during the summer months, but it was used year round. (b) (7)(C) said that they did not think they were doing anything wrong. (b) (7)(C) explained that there was a timer installed on the well. However, what the settings were for the timer, (b) (7)(C) did not know. The meter would tell the pump to increase or decrease the amount of well water to pump.

(b) (7)(C) said that monthly samples were sent out for analysis, which always showed that the water was good. (b) (7)(C) further explained that the water sent for analysis was the commingled water, which consisted of well water mixed with water purchased from Alsip. They did not individually test the well water. (b) (7)(C) said that they "tested the whole pot of stew, not each vegetable." (b) (7)(C) did not know what percentage of well water was mixed with the water purchased from Alsip. The well was used every month, but generally more in the summer months. (b) (7)(C) did say that the commingling of well water with Alsip water was "not routine." (b) (7)(C) could not recall the Illinois EPA labeling the well as contaminated in 1985. (b) (7)(C) also did not recall the Illinois EPA advising the Village not to use the well in 1985. (b) (7)(C) said it was recently brought to (b) (7)(C) attention, and (b) (7)(C) saw it in the newspapers. (b) (7)(C) found out last Thursday, because (b) (7)(C) was on a cruise out of the country and returned then.

(b) (7)(C) stated (b) (7)(C) was not the one who determined when they used the well water or not. It was out of (b) (7)(C) hands. The mayor, (b) (7)(C) directed the activities. (b) (7)(C) did not know how the mayor knew when to run the well. (b) (7)(C), water operator for the Village, received (b) (7)(C) instructions from the mayor. The only directions (b) (7)(C) would receive directly from (b) (7)(C) were service type requests. If the mayor told (b) (7)(C) to get the well running, (b) (7)(C) would tell (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) did not receive the "pumpage" reports from the well. (b) (7)(C) knew the well was being used, but it was not something (b) (7)(C) was concentrating on. According to (b) (7)(C) you could not taste the well water mixed with the Alsip water.

(b) (7)(C) said that the use of the well was not something that the Village

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number

0500-0614

was trying to covertly use. They took readings at the pump house every day of the well when it was operating. The Village was also not open with the fact that it was not using the well. It was not hidden, but the Village was not open with it either. (b) (7)(C) also said it was common knowledge among the citizens of Crestwood that commingling was being done. Furthermore, the contamination of the well was never an issue that (b) (7)(C) was aware of. (b) (7)(C) also said that (b) never took a call that (b) can recall over the quality concerns of the drinking water. (b) (7)(C) did not know when the Village started commingling water. Somewhere along the line, (b) heard it was an acceptable practice, but (b) cannot recall from whom (b) heard this.

(b) (7)(C) was familiar with the federally mandated consumer confidence reports. (b) (7)(C) said (b) put the consumer confidence report in the Village newsletter, The Crestwood Advisor, and that it had to be published by the 1st of July. (b) (7)(C) stated (b) just published it, and did not understand it. (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) got together and put the consumer confidence report together. (b) (7)(C) said (b) was unaware of the various differences in regulations between city water and ground water.

With regard to monthly operating reports (MORs) or monthly monitoring reports (MMRs), (b) (7)(C) said (b) was also familiar with them, but had nothing to do with them. According to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) had to file the MORs because (b) had a class C license. Either (b) (7)(C) or (b) (b) (7)(C), another class C operator for the Village, probably took samples for the MORs. (b) (7)(C) believed that the records were probably kept at the Village Hall. (b) (7)(C) said that the samples that were collected for analysis were sent back satisfactorily, which (b) said was included in a report that the Water Department prepared for the trustee of the Water Department, (b) (7)(C), and discussed at Village meetings. These reports were prepared by (b) (7)(C).

Insofar as the maintenance of the water distribution system was concerned, (b) (7)(C) said either the Public Works Department or private contractors performed maintenance work. It depended upon the job. (b) (7)(C) said (b) had a list of three or four contractors lined up. This included (b) (7)(C) (out of Alsip), (b) (7)(C) Construction (Alsip), MR Plumbing (Crestwood) and Defoggio Plumbing. The Village Engineer for a long time, according to (b) (7)(C) was (b) (7)(C) Engineers & Associates, up until 2000. Then the Village went through several other engineers before going with (b) (7)(C) Engineers.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number

0500-0614

(b) (7)(C) said it was possible (b) was present during inspections by the Illinois EPA. (b) has no reason to believe now that bad water was distributed to the Village. In fact, someone read to (b) recently a statement from the Illinois EPA stating that the Village was not at risk. (b) (7)(C) said (b) is not concerned with the quality of the drinking water. (b) hopes that is the case. In retrospect, (b) (7)(C) does not know if they should have commingled the water. If they did wrong, then they did wrong. At this time, (b) (7)(C) said, (b) is just as confused as everyone else with the information that is going around. (b) (7)(C) said (b) is just telling us what (b) knows. (b) said (b) does not really recall being told by the mayor not to tell anyone that the Village was not using the well. (b) (7)(C) also denied ever telling anyone not to say anything about the well. When asked why someone would make such an accusation against (b) (b) (7)(C) said (b) did not know.

(b) (7)(C) is concerned about (b) exposure, very concerned. (b) (7)(C) said that (b) has been a part of the administration and the commingling of the drinking water went on, it went on when (b) was there, and therefore (b) is a part of it. Again, (b) (7)(C) said (b) did not feel they were doing wrong, now (b) does not know. The Village workers told (b) (7)(C) they were trying to find a letter from 1985 which showed they could not use the well. The Village has not been able to find such a notice to cease and desist, except a letter from 2007, with which the Village complied. According to (b) (7)(C), the Village would not hide anything. (b) (7)(C) said (b) has not been involved in any discussions about the drinking water since it has come to the forefront.

According to (b) (7)(C), the City of Chicago has increased its water rates 14% and 13% respectively over the last few years. The Village adds a small margin of mark-up on the water to run its operations. The Water Department did not have any money difficulties. The Water Department operated off of a separate bond and the Village could not commingle water monies with other monies. It was a stand alone operation. The Village receives most of its revenue from sales taxes, state income taxes, and real estate taxes mostly from commercial sources, there are over 500 businesses in town. The sales taxes have been quite strong, except recently, which enables the Village to give tax refunds to virtually all residents.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.